

Appl.No.: 09/732,337

Amendment dated September 16, 2004

Response to Office Action mailed June 16, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration are hereby requested.

Claims 1, 10, 16, and 18 were rejected as anticipated by Ogata. The Examiner cited the encoder of Fig.4 for splitting input K_i into X_{Ho} and X_{Lo} and the decoder of Fig.5 for reversing the process.

Applicants reply that the Fig.4 encoder downsamples X_{Ho} by a factor of 2 in 12H; whereas, the fourth clause of claims 1 and 10 requires a highband coder without downsampling. Similarly, the second clause of claim 16 (and thus dependent claim 18) requires a highband decoder operate at a higher sampling rate than the lowband decoder, but the decoder of Fig.5 has adder 29 taking the the decoded lowband as the output of filter 28L, and thus there is no converter as required by the third clause of claim 16.

Dependent claims 2, 4-9, 11-15, 17, and 19-20 were rejected as unpatentable over Ogata.

Applicants rely upon the patentability of the independent claims.

Claims 1-9 were rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement due to a lack of a description of the "combiner" of the claims.

Applicants reply that Fig.1 shows bits(1) and bits(2) transmitted through the transmission channel, and thus one of ordinary skill would understand a combiner of bits(1) and bits(2).

Claim 4 was rejected as indefinite due to a lack of antecedent basis for "low band speech coder" in line 1.


Applicants reply that the antecedent basis is in the third clause in parent claim 1.

Appl.No.: 09/732,337

Amendment dated September 16, 2004

Response to Office Action mailed June 16, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Carlton H. Hoel

Reg. No. 29,934

Texas Instruments Incorporated

PO Box 655474, M/S 3999

Dallas, Texas 75265

972.917.4365